

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 6-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyson (U.S. Patent No. 5,050,212) in view of Zizzi (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,681). In response, Applicants amended the independent claims to recite a folder determining unit for determining whether or not a folder that is designated corresponds to a folder for which predetermined signature processing should be performed on a file stored therein, and respectfully traverse.

Dyson discloses a method and apparatus for verifying the integrity of a file stored separately from a computer. Applicants believe that the technology of Dyson corresponds to the related art described in the background of the present application. Dyson does not disclose or suggest a folder determining unit, as now recited in the amended claims.

Zizzi discloses a method of transparent encryption and decryption for an electronic document management system. In this art, Applicants believe that a document is encrypted or decrypted before it is transferred to an electronic document management system. This process is different from the present invention, which is directed to introducing an easy signature verification system. For this reason, Applicants believe that there is no motivation to combine Dyson and Zizzi. Moreover, Zizzi fails to disclose or suggest the folder determining unit, as now recited in the amended claims.

In contrast, the present invention has the following features. First, signature verification can be easily performed within any client *e.g.*, a personal computer, without using a predetermined server. Second, it is not necessary to start a special

application for signature verification to prove whether or not a relevant file has correct information. Rather, when a user uses an existing user application, upon opening a file on a level of an operating system, signature verification is automatically carried out.

Furthermore, when the user closes a file, a signature is automatically produced therefrom and given to the file when the file is updated. If the file is tampered with, then the tampering is detected from the signature verification automatically. Thus, the tampering is reported to the user. Otherwise, the user is not aware of the operation of signature verification system.

Finally, depending on a user's condition or an applied user application, it is possible to control a mode of a signature verification setting condition by using a mode table, such as that shown in FIG. 10 and disclosed in the specification of the present application. Since the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the above features, including the folder determining unit, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 1-2 and 6-15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyson and Zizzi and further in view of Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,481). Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 6-15 based on the Dyson and Zizzi references, and because Walsh fails to overcome the deficiencies.

Walsh discloses a method and apparatus for protecting data files on a computer from virus infection. Applicants believe that before a file is opened in Walsh, it is determined whether or not the file is infected by a computer virus. For this reason,

this art is different from the present invention, which is directed to introducing an easy signature verification system. Thus, there is no motivation to combine the art of Dyson with the art of Walsh. In addition, Walsh fails to disclose or suggest the folder determining unit as now recited in amended claim 1, from which claims 3-5 directly or indirectly depend. For all of these reasons, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 3-5 is respectfully requested.


Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dyson in view of Zizzi, and further in view of Depew (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,342). Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 6-15, and because Depew fails to overcome the above deficiencies.

Depew discloses a PC processing card for decoding operations. Depew fails to disclose the folder determining unit for determining whether or not a folder that is designated corresponds to a folder for which predetermined signature processing should be performed on a file stored therein, as now recited in amended claim 15. In addition, the art of Depew is different from the art of the present invention, namely an easy signature verification system. Therefore, Applicants believe that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Dyson with the teachings of Depew. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 16-17 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

August 10, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer Number 24978